



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,108	08/26/2003	Ankur Bhatt	13906-123001 / 2003P00283	3166
32864	7590	08/05/2008	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ANTONIENKO, DEBRA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3689	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/05/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/648,108

Applicant(s)

BHATT ET AL.

Examiner

DEBRA ANTONIENKO

Art Unit

3689

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/08/2003, 01/18/2005, 07/29/2005, 04/03/2006, 09/21/2007, 09/25/2007
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. In order for a method to be considered a "process" under §101, a claimed process must either: (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials). *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972). If neither of these requirements is met by the claim, the method is not a patent eligible process under §101 and is non-statutory subject matter. With respect to Claims 1 and 18, the claim language does not include the required tie or transformation and thus is directed to nonstatutory subject matter. Claims 2-17 are dependent and are rejected in a like manner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 3689

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-12, 14-19, 21-30, 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable over Thompson et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,668,253 B1 (hereinafter referred to as Thompson).

Examiner's Note: The Examiner has pointed out particular references contained in the prior art of record within the body of this action for the convenience of the Applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply. Applicant, in preparing the response, should consider fully the entire reference as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Regarding Claims 1 and 19, Thompson teaches a method and computer-readable medium, respectively, of providing object-based content to be reported in an external general reporting application, the method comprising:

receiving a user selection of a business object having associated attributes, and displaying a view of the attributes associated with the selected business object (column 8, lines 15-22; Figure 6);

receiving a user selection of at least one of the attributes, the selected at least one attribute to be displayed in a report generated in the external reporting application, and adding the selected at least one attribute to a business content structure of selected attributes (column 8, lines 29-35 and 53-61);

retrieving data associated with the business content structure (column 4, lines 31-32; column 14, lines 9-19); and

generating an output file that the external reporting application can use to generate the report, the report to include the business content structure and the data associated therewith (Figures 12-14).

Regarding Claims 3, 8, 10 and 21, 26, 28, respectively, Thompson further teaches wherein the business content structure represents meta-data information (column 32, line 37 – column 33, lines 55).

Regarding Claims 4 and 22, Thompson further teaches displaying a view of a plurality of business content structures and receiving a user selection of one of the business content structures to be included in a report (column 8, lines 29-35; Figure 6).

Regarding Claims 5 and 23, Thompson further teaches displaying a view of a plurality of business objects each having associated attributes, and wherein each of the business objects has a defined relationship to the selected business object (column 7, lines 12-14; Figure 4).

Regarding Claims 6 and 24, Thompson further teaches displaying a view of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects (Figure 6).

Regarding Claims 7 and 25, Thompson further teaches receiving a user selection of at least one of the attributes for the plurality of related business objects, the selected at least one attribute to be displayed in a report generated in the external reporting application, and adding the selected at least one attribute to the business content structure of selected attributes (column 8, lines 29-35 and 53-61).

Regarding Claims 9 and 27, Thompson further teaches defining a calculated field to be included in the business content structure, wherein the calculated field is associated with a function that takes one or more business object attributes as input, and uses a formula to compute a resultant value for the calculated field based on the input (column 7, lines 47-54; column 9, lines 34-44; subtotals).

Regarding Claims 11 and 29, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein the resultant value is included in the output file. However, Thompson teaches calculation capabilities, subtotals (see Claims 9 and 27), as well as the capability to consolidate financial information. Also, Thompson discloses the use of third party product for use in reporting (column 30, lines 30-41; Figure 4). It is obvious that the subtotals or resultant values are in the output file so that they can be used in the external reporting application.

Regarding Claims 12 and 30, Thompson further teaches persistently storing the business content structure in a database (column 4, lines 56-59).

Regarding Claims 14 and 32, Thompson further teaches wherein retrieving the data associated with the business content structure comprises constructing and filing at least one database query (column 14, lines 9-19).

Regarding Claims 15 and 33, Thompson further teaches wherein the database query is an SQL query that uses the concept of derived tables (column 14, lines 9-19).

Regarding Claims 16 and 34, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein the output file is an ActiveX Data Object Recordset. However, Thompson discloses the invention operates on browsers with support for ActiveX controls (column 30, lines 49-54). It would be obvious to use ActiveX Data Object Recordsets as output files.

Regarding Claims 17 and 35, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein generating the output file that the external reporting application can use to generate the report further comprises transferring the output file to a reporting-tool-specific interface component capable of plug-and-play interaction with the external reporting application. However, Thompson discloses the use of MicroStrategyTM DSS Web (column 12, lines 45-59) which is known to employ plug-n-play components.

Regarding Claim 18, Thompson further teaches a method of providing object-based content to be reported in an external general reporting application, the method comprising:

receiving a user selection of a business object having associated attributes, and displaying a view of the attributes associated with the selected business object (column 8, lines 15-22; Figure 6);

receiving a user selection of at least one of the attributes, the selected at least one attribute to be displayed in a report generated in the external reporting application, and

Art Unit: 3689

adding the selected at least one attribute to a business content structure of selected attributes (column 8, lines 29-35 and 53-61)); and

persistently storing the business content structure in a database so that it can later be retrieved and used to generate an output file that the external reporting application can use to generate the report with current data (column 4, lines 56-59).

4. Claims 2 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of SAMS Teach Yourself Microsoft Access 2000 (hereinafter referred to as Access).

Regarding Claims 2 and 20, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein a business content design wizard assists in defining the business content structure. However, Access discloses creating databases and tables with a wizard (pages 201-214). Wizards are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the Thompson invention to incorporate wizards in order to provide an efficient and user-friendly way to create databases and tables.

5. Claims 13 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Bata et al., U.S. Patent Number 6,901,403 B1 (hereinafter referred to as Bata).

Regarding Claims 13 and 31, Thompson does not explicitly teach wherein the business content structure is stored as an XML document in the database, and wherein the business content structure attributes correspond to tags in the XML document.

However, Bata teaches the use of XML in the representation of data (Figure 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Thompson to incorporate XML into the invention as the XML format is well known for being conducive to capturing the structure of data for network functionality.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kesler (U.S. Patent Number 7,062,502 B1) teaches developing a user interface from metadata.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DEBRA ANTONIENKO whose telephone number is (571)270-3601. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 7:30 AM to 4:00 PM, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janice Mooneyham can be reached on 571-272-6805. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3689

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DA

/Janice A. Mooneyham/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3689